

**TESTIMONY OF JAY VROOM
PRESIDENT and CEO
CROPLIFE AMERICA
BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
SEPTEMBER 13, 2006**

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am Jay Vroom, President of CropLife America (CLA). CLA is a national trade association representing the manufacturers, distributors and formulators of virtually all crop protection chemicals used in the United States. I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today.

I want to begin by commending this committee and the entire Congress for the tremendous success of the previous farm bills in achieving unparalleled environmental benefits, particularly in the area of soil and water conservation. Previous farm bills have arguably had the greatest positive environmental impact of any legislation in the history of the United States Congress. At the same time, recent farm bills have also provided an important safety net for American farmers and ranchers who are committed to providing a safe and abundant food supply for this country and beyond. These farmers are our customers and we call on Congress to continue to adopt policies in the next farm bill that maintain a level of predictability in an industry that is marked with tremendous volatility and uncertainty.

We also believe that increased international trade has already significantly aided the U.S. farm economy, and there is even more potential for even greater farm exports—hence we commend the Committee's careful consideration of farm policy components that can serve to encourage more trade opportunities. It is clear from the work that you have already done that the House Committee on Agriculture will maintain the careful balance between the necessary safety net and trade agreement compliance.

Today, I will primarily emphasize the crop protection industry's role in contributing to agricultural conservation. I will also mention a few other major policy challenges on the horizon.

Producing and marketing crop protection products involves a complex matrix of factors, including crops, competitive chemicals, soil/climate conditions, geographic region, patent life and data protection, liability costs, minor use considerations, regulatory compliance, transition to and reinvestment in "safer" products, research and development costs, and a multitude of other considerations. We are pleased that our member company investments in research and development have provided a vast arsenal of insect, disease and weed control tools for American farmers. Yields of many crops in the U.S. have doubled and tripled since the introduction of modern pesticides and much of this increase is due to the effectiveness of these tools in controlling crop pests.

Soil Conservation

Herbicides have been used on more than 90% of US acreage of most crops for the past forty years. The use of herbicides has greatly reduced soil erosion, decreased the need for millions of hours of difficult labor by workers in the field, and has helped keep American agriculture competitive due to their low cost and high degree of effectiveness. The performance bar is very high for herbicides. Farmers expect more than 95% season long control of all key weed species in their fields with one or two applications and without injury to their crops. No other weed control technology is remotely close to delivering these benefits.

The USDA has reported that cropland soil erosion declined by 700 million tons per year between 1982 and 2003. This reduction has coincided with adoption of practices that conserve soil. No-till crop production, in which the soil is left undisturbed by tillage, is the most effective soil-conserving system. Elimination of tillage means that the grower must rely on herbicides to control weeds. No-till acres increased to 62 million in 2004.

The external costs of soil erosion include higher susceptibility to flood damage, lost reservoir capacity, increased water treatment costs, and cost impacts to waterway navigation and recreational activities. Research from the CropLife Foundation indicates that by reducing erosion from cropland, no-till reduces these external damages by \$1.5 billion per year. Of course, the farmer benefits too. With more soil staying on his land, those farms remain more productive and profitable.

Labor and Energy Conservation

The use of herbicides greatly reduces the need for both fuel and laborers on U.S. farms. Without herbicides, the need for fuel would increase by 337 million gallons, since twice as many cultivation trips would be needed to replace herbicide spray trips. Furthermore, cultivators use four times more fuel per trip than herbicide sprayers.

Herbicides also play a key role in the U.S. ethanol production, a sector which is projected to expand to seven billion gallons in 2010. Corn is the primary raw material for US ethanol production. On average, herbicides increase U.S. corn production by 20%. If corn growers did not use herbicides, the decline in corn production would be equivalent to the total projected ethanol capacity of seven billion gallons.

If farmers did not use herbicides, the alternatives for weed control would be increased mechanical cultivation and increased hand labor to pull weeds. Research from the CropLife Foundation indicates that a minimum of 1.1 billion hours of hand labor would be required at peak season for hand weeding necessitating the employment of seven million more agricultural workers. Even with the increased cultivation and hand weeding, crop yields would be 20% lower. Approximately 70 million workers would be needed to prevent any yield loss without herbicides.

Organic growers do not use herbicides to control weed populations. Organic farms rely on laborers with hoes and numerous cultivation trips to remove weeds from their fields. Growers of organic vegetable crops spend close to \$1,000 per acre for weed control in comparison to the \$50 per acre spent by growers who use herbicides. 50-100 hours of labor are required for each organic vegetable acre. Each hour of labor is budgeted at \$10 which covers a minimum wage, plus administrative, supervisory, transportation and benefit costs. It should come as no surprise that the production of organic crops is being outsourced to countries such as Mexico and China where the cost of farm labor is \$1 per hour or less.

Water Conservation and Quality

CropLife America's member companies' know that protecting water quality and conserving scarce water resources in agriculture must often start in the laboratory, where products are developed, tested, evaluated and approved for use. Their efforts start with using the best science available to develop good products that can provide the needed results. This attitude and approach has led to major water conservation and water quality benefits in the U.S. and worldwide.

One excellent strategy to successfully conserve scarce supplies of water for agricultural and other critical uses is to develop crop varieties that are uniquely adapted to drought and other forms of weather stress. Our member companies have created plant varieties that are drought resistant or tolerant, allowing a crop to be produced with less irrigation and thereby conserving scarce water resources. We have also created plant varieties that have resulted in innovative crop production practices, like the use of pre-germinated rice seeds that require 15 to 20 percent less total water to produce a crop relative to more traditional rice production practices. Our science has also led to a crop protection product that can control weeds in rice production that previously could only be controlled through flooding rice land, thereby avoiding the use of water that could be better dedicated to other critical purposes. Of course, all herbicides for all crops are designed to control weeds that would otherwise grow and use precious water.

Crop protection science and water quality protection go hand-in-hand. Over the 10-year process of developing and bringing a crop protection product to the market, our companies ask three primary questions related to water quality considerations:

- 1) Does the compound reach water and how?
- 2) How does the compound behave when it reaches water, if ever?
- 3) How does the compound affect water quality and the health of living organisms?

Numerous rigorous scientific tests are conducted on a candidate compound and its metabolites to answer these questions. We also use the same science to determine if sound, reasonable and practical management strategies are available to ensure that the products can be used without unreasonable adverse water quality risks. The studies conducted involve identifying the compound's decomposition pathways within different crops, soils and water circumstances. Once the degradation patterns have been established, analysis methods are developed for measuring residues.

Other studies analyze the effects of the compound and its major metabolites on living organisms such as non-target insects, birds, soil and aquatic animals, and soil micro-organisms. Such trials are run not only during product development but also after their market launch. In fact, products are subject to continued monitoring and re-evaluation, taking into account the latest state of the art developments. As far as aquatic organisms are concerned, compounds are tested not only on fish, but also on algae and water-fleas. Overall great efforts are made to constantly improve the testing methods for the protection of even the smallest organism in natural water bodies.

Our companies are also continuously engaged in research and development to find ways to minimize the amount of water needed to spray crop protection products while maintaining their efficiency and efficacy. New spray nozzles, for example, can reduce water consumption by approximately 80%, from 530 gallons per acre to 105 gallons. The use of low volume water-based sprays combined with application nozzles that target each crop row can decrease water use by 95 percent or more, from 210 gallons of water per acre to only 7 or 8.

Even after our products reach the market and are being used in the field, our member companies continue to pursue innovative and practical crop protection product management strategies. We have been leaders in the marketing and use of streamside buffer zones and filter strips as a way to improve water quality, reduce soil erosion, and increase wildlife habitat.

Likewise, our products also help conserve water in non-agricultural settings. One critical example is their use as part of an integrated program to control noxious and invasive plant species. For example the Salt Cedar tree was originally introduced into the US from Central Asia to prevent soil erosion near rivers and lakes. But Salt Cedar is often able to thoroughly out-compete native plant species and in the process absorb and transpire enormous quantities of water. One mature Salt Cedar plant may withdraw up to 198 gallons of water per day. Where these trees have become established, water levels in rivers and streams and groundwater tables have lowered, and water supplies for urban, agricultural, wildlife and recreational uses become threatened or diminished. Our crop protection products have been used in public initiatives as part of an overall management strategy in key areas of the US to control Salt Cedar. In the case of one prominent project in Texas and New Mexico, this has resulted in an estimated increase of over 15 billion gallons of river flow during a year long season.

Our aquatic products also preserve and protect water quality through the elimination or control of noxious or exotic aquatic plant species in rivers, streams, lakes and estuaries. Like Salt Cedar, these alien, invasive plants out-compete the native aquatic plants, and in the process diminish or eliminate plant biodiversity and degrade or destroy fish habitat. These invasive aquatic plants include species like Eurasian Water Milfoil, Water Hyacinth, Hydrilla, Purple Loosestrife and Melaleuca. Used as part of an overall aquatic invasive plant management strategy, aquatic herbicides can selectively control populations of invasive plants and support the restoration of native plant communities and quality aquatic wildlife habitat. Control of

these invasive plants can have substantial water conservation benefits because their sheer mass can impede or stop the flow of water and increase rates of evaporation and other pathways of water loss that would otherwise be used for irrigation.

Wildlife Conservation

One often over-looked contribution that pesticides make is in the area of wildlife habitat restoration and conservation. Conservation scientists rank habitat destruction and nuisance plants as the two most serious threats to endangered species, both plant and animal, and many of our pesticides provide significant benefits for endangered species by reducing the amount of land needed to produce crops, thereby preserving critical wildlife habitat.

Equally important, pesticides increase the diversity and quality of natural habitat through the effective control of non-native or nuisance plants that seriously threaten endangered species as well as damage lakes and streams, farms and natural areas.

Two years ago, CropLife joined forces with one of the country's leading conservation organizations, Ducks Unlimited (DU), and established a Conservation/Technology Initiative. This unique partnership harnessed the power of crop science technology in conjunction with wildlife biologists' expertise to reduce the abundance of exotic grasses and other weeds at wildlife refuges and other sites where DU seeks to restore native grasslands. The key here is to use herbicides and fungicides to suppress the weed production long enough for native grasses to reestablish. Because many native plants are perennials, once reestablished, they can flourish for decades under proper management.

Another one of this initiative's specific projects was a demonstration pilot to show how the use of certain pesticides could enable farmers to economically switch to winter wheat from spring wheat in the northern plains—again to the benefit of duck populations.

CropLife member companies are in the second year of this five-year partnership with DU and the results are already very encouraging. Habitat restoration is well underway at 20 sites nationwide and the benefits to waterfowl and other wildlife are being recorded. Beyond the contributions being realized for wildlife conservation efforts, these projects are also having a beneficial ripple effect for outdoor enthusiasts. At a number of the areas, control of nuisance plants and weeds is helping aquaculture, water-related recreational activities, hunting and fishing, bird watching and natural scenic restoration.

Stewardship

CLA strongly believes in the power of public/private partnerships to steward pesticides. Over the past 5 years, more than 35 million pounds of pesticide plastic containers were recycled because industry, extension offices, and state governments have worked together to provide farmers the opportunity to voluntarily recycle containers. Eleven states lead the way in promoting recycling and

have worked hand-in-hand with our industry program called the Ag Container Recycling Council (ACRC).

CLA would very much like to see the expansion of voluntarily recycling; however, only the member companies of CLA are currently underwriting the costs of ACRC. In order to sustain this program and increase pesticide container recycling rates in the U.S., we have asked the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to develop a rule to require all registrants to financially support recycling initiatives such as ACRC. The rule could be based upon a recent pesticide container recycling standard developed in conjunction with the American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers and approved by the American National Standards Institute. The House Interior/EPA Appropriations bill this year clearly acknowledges the importance of such a regulatory step and would instruct EPA to proceed expeditiously.

We are also seeking ways to expand industry stewardship efforts in the area of facility safety. Over the past three years, CLA member companies have sponsored a program called the American Agronomic Stewardship Alliance (AASA) to inspect all pesticide bulk facilities in the country. Through an electronic database, CLA members can obtain inspection reports to ensure that facilities they do business with can properly store and handle their products in bulk quantities. This program will become an important tool in helping agricultural retailers and distributors meet and exceed the requirements recently finalized by EPA in the agency's Container and Containment Rule.

Endangered Species Act

One of our industry's most significant policy objectives is the modernization of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). CLA supports practical, balanced and scientifically-sound amendments to the ESA to make it effective in recovering and saving species at risk. We believe Congress needs to amend the ESA to improve the availability of new technology and crop protection products for species habitat recovery. A huge step was taken last fall when the House passed H.R. 3824, the "Threatened and Endangered Species Recovery Act." We call on the Senate to pass similar legislation.

When the ESA was enacted in 1973, there were 109 species listed for protection. Today there are roughly 1,000 U.S. species listed as threatened or endangered, nearly 300 species considered as "candidates" for listing, and nearly 4,000 "species of concern." The authorization for federal funding of ESA activities expired on October 1, 1992, though the U.S. Congress has appropriated funds in each succeeding year to keep the program active.

On August 5, 2004, following coordination with EPA and the United State Department of Agriculture (USDA), the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service published joint counterpart regulations, which streamlined the interagency consultation process for endangered species risk assessments for pesticides. These new regulations intended to marry the effects analyses

requirement of ESA with the scientific-based, data-intensive environmental analyses required by the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA).

The need for such regulations had been highlighted by a string of ESA citizen suits alleging that EPA failed to consult with FWS and NMFS when registering pesticides. The concerns about current court decisions and threats of additional litigation have created piecemeal regulatory process, as well as unnecessary restrictions for pesticide products. These lawsuits have cost taxpayers millions of dollars as EPA defends itself against a process that does nothing to improve protections for endangered species. Just in the Pacific Northwest states, USDA estimates that the impact of one of the major ESA/pesticides court decisions on agriculture is approximately \$583 million annually. There are approximately 10 similar lawsuit filings across the country.

Furthermore, just last month, a federal judge in Washington State found portions of the ESA counterpart regulation to be invalid, thus increasing the uncertainty surrounding the pesticide registration process and threatening farmer's access to important crop protection products. Congressional action is needed so these products, which are so critical for food and fiber production, will not be terminated or compromised in the interim by further court orders or settlement agreements.

FQPA Ten-Year Deadline

EPA deserves recognition for its accomplishment mandated by the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) to reassess pesticide residue tolerances by August 3, 2006.

EPA's work over the past 10 years has resulted in the reassessment of nearly 10,000 residue limits. CLA and our members have worked with the Agency in the administration of FQPA, but we continue to have certain on-going concerns with its implementation. Continuing political pressure has been directed at EPA to push FQPA beyond its original, science-based intent while growers, food companies and the crop protection industry have worked for a more reasoned regulatory policy.

During this 10-year process, many decisions that negatively affected pesticide products were shaped by political pressures. Some of these matters are still open today, such as the battle over the use of ethically produced human clinical and worker exposure data in regulatory decisions. It is important that EPA applies transparency and good science policy to allow statutory standards to be clearly applied to pesticide regulations.

Congress passed FQPA in 1996 and the act went into effect immediately. As a result of the new law, better scientific methodology was developed and implemented, such as reviews of the Environmental Fate model updates. Throughout the reassessment procedure, a wealth of valuable data was generated, including Market Basket residue surveys, exposure data, crop profiles, biomonitoring information, and water monitoring data. At the same time, risk assessment methodology was carried out in a much more transparent fashion.

Industry developments during this period focused on bringing newer, more effective pesticides to the market. Through the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA), industry fees allowed EPA to maintain and accelerate its pace on tolerance reassessment and provide improved time lines and predictability for registration of new pesticide products. PRIA will need to be reauthorized rather soon and we and the rest of the pesticides community stand ready to work with the House Agriculture Committee to accomplish this on a timely and informed bases.

As a result of FQPA and the contributions of EPA, the food chain and the crop protection industry, Americans continue to reap benefits from a rigorous and thorough regulatory program and to enjoy the safest food supply in the world.

Pesticide Registration Improvement Act

PRIA was enacted on January 23, 2004. It requires pesticide registrants and applicants to pay specific service fees to EPA for the registration applications that it handles. This law also establishes specific timelines for EPA to accomplish the various registration actions and prohibits certain other extraneous user fees.

The intent of the law is to provide additional resources for EPA's registration efforts and a more predictable evaluation process. As enacted, PRIA will be effective for five years and it continues the prohibition on the collection of pesticide registration fees (40 CFR Part 152.400), which has been in effect since FIFRA was amended in 1988. PRIA also suspends collection of tolerance fees authorized by the Federal Food Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) (40 CFR Part 180.33).

CLA has successfully helped lead an Industry Fees Coalition that included all trade associations representing pesticide registrants and worked closely with environmental and labor groups in lobbying Congress for passage of PRIA, in defending PRIA since its enactment, and in implementing PRIA with EPA.

In addition to the new registration service fees, PRIA retained and increased the product maintenance fees that support reregistration and tolerance reassessment under FQPA. Industry is projected to pay a total of more than \$200 million over a five year period. The registration service fees and increased maintenance fees went into effect in the spring of 2004.

The amount of the pesticide registration service fees and the timetables for the review periods vary somewhat from year to year to provide for phasing in the new timelines. Since 1989, federal budget proposals by various administrations have repeatedly sought to reinstate the original pesticide registration fees for new products (40 CFR Part 152.400) through modification of FIFRA. For FY 2007, OMB has proposed in the President's Budget increasing pesticide user fees from anticipated revenues of \$31 million in PRIA and maintenance fees to a total of \$87 million by increasing both PRIA and maintenance fees, reinstating tolerance fees and creating a new "registration review fee."

Fortunately, Congress has repeatedly barred collection of these other fees and ignored Administration proposals to modify FIFRA and FFDCA accordingly.

Proposals for additional registration and tolerance fees would violate the spirit of the compromise that resulted in the passage of PRIA.

PRIA has been successful in improving the predictability and speed of the pesticide registration process, and CLA calls on Congress and specifically this committee to reauthorize this important law.

NPDES Clean Water Act Permits

In 1972, Congress enacted the Clean Water Act and the FIFRA. The Clean Water Act authorized EPA to protect the nation's waterways by regulating discharges of large industrial operations and wastewater facilities through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). FIFRA provided EPA with the authority to regulate the sale and use of pesticides through a comprehensive registration and labeling protocol.

Although CWA and its NPDES permit requirements have been in effect for over thirty years, no government agency has ever concluded that the application of pesticides in accordance with label directions requires an NPDES "point source" permit, including aquatic mosquito and weed control, as well as terrestrial uses that may result in incidental spray drift entering water. FIFRA already requires strict testing of pesticides to ensure water quality and aquatic species preservation; therefore, an NPDES permit for pesticide applications has always been considered unnecessary and duplicative.

However, in March of 2001, the U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in *Headwaters, Inc. v. Talent Irrigation District* that NPDES permits were required for the use of aquatic herbicides to control weeds in waterways. In November 2002, the Ninth Circuit ruled in *League of Wilderness Defenders v. Forsgren* that an airplane used for the application of moth control products in the forest canopy was a "point source" pollutant and therefore aerial spraying of pesticides required an NPDES permit under the Clean Water Act. Other similar cases are pending, and activist groups are now using this unfortunate precedent to threaten lawsuits against American farmers who must make millions of pesticide applications every year in order to maintain viable crops.

Furthermore, since NPDES permits were never intended to be used for pesticide applications, federal and state agencies are not prepared to handle the massive rise in permit requests from farmers who must spray regularly throughout the growing season. In many states, obtaining an NPDES permit is very costly, time consuming and bureaucratic. It is not practical to expect American farmers to bear such a major expense and delay urgent applications in the event of a fast developing pest infestation.

EPA has issued several interpretive statements over the past two years reiterating its position that NPDES permits are not required for pesticide applications directly to or near waters of the United States. A proposed rule is currently pending at EPA, which would codify the agency's position.

While EPA's proposed rule is certainly a positive development, the agriculture industry believes that nothing short of legislation will remove the threat of lawsuits against farmers. EPA has also acknowledged that a rule will not alleviate the threat of litigation. Farmers, irrigators, mosquito abatement districts, fire fighters, federal and state agencies, pest control operators and foresters will all benefit if Congress chooses to clarify current law. We commend Congressmen Butch Otter and Dennis Cardoza and a total of 76 other bipartisan cosponsors for introducing H.R. 1749, "The Pest Management and Fire Suppression Flexibility Act." We encourage Congress swiftly adopt this legislation to resolve this important issue.

Organic Agriculture

While CLA respects the right of consumers to have a variety of options in the grocery store, there are countless misperceptions about organic agriculture. It has often been said that organic crop production is the fastest growing segment in US agriculture. That is not the case. Organic crop production increased from 400,000 acres in 1992 to 1.4 million acres in 2003. Rather, the fastest growing segments of U.S. agriculture have been those reliant on herbicides. No till crop growing increased from 15 million acres in 1989 to 62 million acres in 2004. The number of biotech herbicide tolerant acres where herbicides are used with crops that have been genetically engineered for tolerance increased from less than 100,000 acres in 1995 to over 90 million acres by 2005. Organic acres account for less than 1% of total US crop acreage largely because these growers are not permitted the use of chemical herbicides to control weeds.

The difficulties that organic growers have with controlling weeds without herbicides is well illustrated by a recent exemption from farm worker safety rules granted to organic growers in California. The organic growers were granted an exemption from a rule that banned the practice of having workers pull weeds by hand. The California Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board concluded that hand weeding results in a substantial risk of permanent back injury to workers. Organic growers claimed that they would incur severe profit losses if they could not use hand weeding and they were granted an exemption to the state law.

While we acknowledge that a small segment of American consumers may prefer to purchase organic produce, CLA does not believe organic agriculture should be preferentially subsidized or promoted by Congress during the upcoming farm bill.

Economic Benefits of Pesticides

The importance of pesticides in protecting American crop production can easily be understood by looking at the value of fungicides in the growing of fruit and vegetables. Most of the nation's fruit and vegetable acres are sprayed with fungicides every year to prevent the crops from being infected with fungi and bacteria that cause crops to rot. These fungi are ubiquitous in the environment. We have never had widespread commercial production of fruit and vegetables in this country without the spraying of fungicides. For more than one hundred years, close to 100% of the apples, potatoes, peaches and grapes have been treated with fungicides. Without fungicide use, yields of most crops would decline by more than

50% while it would be impossible for widespread commercial production of certain crops like apples and grapes. Fungicides are extremely economical for US growers. A recent study from the CropLife Foundation calculated that U.S. growers receive a net benefit of \$15 for every \$1 that is spent on fungicides and their application. There aren't many technologies in the U.S. economy that can match that rate of economic return.

Conclusion

Thank you again for the opportunity to share our views with the committee. When writing the next farm bill, we encourage you to consider the numerous benefits of pesticides for conservation and crop production, and the ultimate benefit to food consumers here in our country and the fantastic earnings the U.S. enjoys from having food and fiber surplus available to export to consumers around the world.

Committee on Agriculture
U.S. House of Representatives
Required Witness Disclosure Form

House Rules* require nongovernmental witnesses to disclose the amount and source of Federal grants received since October 1, 2004.

Name: Jay J. Vroom
Address: 1156 Fifteenth Street, NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 872-3849
Organization you represent (if any): CropLife America

1. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants and subcontracts) you have received since October 1, 2004, as well as the source and the amount of each grant or contract. House Rules do **NOT** require disclosure of federal payments to individuals, such as Social Security or Medicare benefits, farm program payments, or assistance to agricultural producers:

Source: NONE Amount: _____

Source: _____ Amount: _____

2. If you are appearing on behalf of an organization, please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants and subcontracts) the organization has received since October 1, 2004, as well as the source and the amount of each grant or contract:

Source: NONE Amount: _____

Source: _____ Amount: _____

Please check here if this form is NOT applicable to you: _____

Signature: Jay J. Vroom

* Rule XI, clause 2(g)(4) of the U.S. House of Representatives provides: *Each committee shall, to the greatest extent practicable, require witnesses who appear before it to submit in advance written statements of proposed testimony and to limit their initial presentations to the committee to brief summaries thereof. In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two previous fiscal years by the witness or by any entity represented by the witness.*

PLEASE ATTACH DISCLOSURE FORM TO EACH COPY OF TESTIMONY.

Biographical Sketch

JAY J. VROOM
President & CEO
CropLife America

Jay Vroom became the chief executive of the trade association now known as CropLife America in 1989 and has been a leader in US agribusiness trade associations for his entire career. At CropLife he heads the organization that is the leading US trade group for the crop protection chemicals and crop biotechnology industries in the States. CLA is primarily involved in issue management and advocacy for the industry and its US agricultural allies.

CLA does Federal and state lobbying, science and regulatory advocacy, and proactive litigation work on behalf of its members. Through CLA's membership in the Brussels-based global federation CropLife International, the US organization is a strong voice in many international venues on critical issues to the plant sciences industry. Vroom is a senior member of CropLife International's Executive Committee.

Based in Washington, DC, CropLife America has a principal staff of more than 30 professionals with expertise in communications, lobbying, science and technical work, legal affairs, and market research. CLA operates with several affiliated organizations—CropLife Foundation of which Vroom is Board Chairman, CropLife Political Action Committee of which he is Treasurer, and RISE

(Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment) which is a parallel organization to CLA working on issues pertinent to the non-agricultural uses of pesticides and fertilizers. Also affiliated with CLA are the Ag Container Recycling Corporation (ACRC), RAPID (the industry's electronic commerce standards and advancement organization) and the American Agronomic Stewardship Alliance (AASA).

Prior to joining CropLife staff Jay Vroom served in various executive capacities with the National Fertilizer Solutions Association, the Merchants Exchange of St. Louis, and The Fertilizer Institute. He was graduated with honors from the University of Illinois College of Agriculture. Vroom was raised on a grain and livestock farm in north-central Illinois and he continues to own that farming operation.